## Case 3:08-cv-05377-JL Document 68 Filed 03/24/11 Page 1 of 3

Case3:08-cv-05377-JL Document67 Filed03/23/11 Page1 of 3

1	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP		
2	ERIC MECKLEY, SBN 168181 STEVEN K. GANOTIS, SBN 234252	<b>P</b> 2 11	
3	email: <a href="mailto:emeckley@morganlewis.com">email: emeckley@morganlewis.com</a>	FILED	
4	One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126	MAR 2 4 2011	
5	Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001	RICHARD W	
6	Attorneys for Defendant	RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK U.S. DISTRIC: COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	LANE BRYANT, INC.	OF GALIFORNIA	
8	RIGHETTI GLUGOSKI, P.C. MATTHEW RIGHETTI, ESQ. {121012}		
_	JOHN GLUGOSKI, ESQ. {191551}		
9	MICHAEL RIGHETTI, ESQ. {258541} 456 Montgomery Street, Suite 1400		
10	San Francisco, ČA 94104 Telephone: (415) 983-0900		
11	Facsimile: (415) 397-9005		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiff Stephanie Priddy		
13			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
15	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
16	STEPHANIE PRIDDY,	Case No. C 08-05377 (JL)	
17	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL WITH	
18	vs.	PREJUDICE	
19	LANE BRYANT, INC., and DOES 1-100,	FRCP Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii)	
20	inclusive		
21	Defendant.		
22			
23	Stanhania Driddy ("Plaintiff" or "Priddy	") and I are Bryant Inc ("Defendant") (Plaintiff	
24	Stephanie Priddy ("Plaintiff" or "Priddy") and Lane Bryant, Inc. ("Defendant") (Plaintiff		
25	and Defendant are together referred to hereinafter as the "Parties") hereby enter into this		
26	Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice of Plaintiff's entire Complaint and all claims stated		
27	therein.		
28 Morgan, Lewis &	WHEREAS, Priddy was employed with the Company from approximately April 21, 200		
BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW		JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
SAN FRANCISCO	DB2/22329758.1	ORDER DISMISSING ACTION	

## Case3:08-cv-05377-JL Document67 Filed03/23/11 Page2 of 3

through approximately June 2, 2008.

WHEREAS, on September 15, 2008, Priddy filed a putative class action complaint against Lane Bryant, Inc. in the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles; on or around October 20, 2008, Defendant removed the action to the United States District Court for the Central District of California based upon diversity of citizenship; and on or around November 26, 2008, the case was transferred to the Northern District of California. Priddy's lawsuit alleged various claims for alleged failure to pay overtime, failure to provide meal and rest periods, failure to provide accurate wage statements, and other wage and non-wage related claims related to her employment with the Company (hereinafter the "Civil Action"). In addition to her individual claims, Priddy sought to maintain such claims on a class and representative action basis.

WHEREAS, on September 7, 2010, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's class claims (Docket #50) for the reasons set forth in Defendant's Memorandum of Points and Authorities, namely that the vast majority of Plaintiff's class claims had been settled and released in the related *Moody v. Charming Shoppes* action (Case No. CV 07-6073) action and that Plaintiff was barred from seeking PAGA penalties for her remaining class claim for violation of California Labor Code section 212.

WHEREAS, the Court granted Defendant's Motion in an Order dated October 29, 2010 (Docket #55) and subsequently remanded the matter to state court for failure to meet the amount in controversy pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act. Plaintiff sought reconsideration of this Order (Docket #56), which was granted in part and denied in part (Docket #63). The Court maintained that Plaintiff could proceed on only her individual claims, but the Court vacated its remand Order and retained jurisdiction over Plaintiff's individual claims.

WHEREAS, subsequently the Parties fully and finally settled and resolved all claims alleged in and related to the Civil Action and any and all outstanding claims, issues and disputes regarding or relating to Priddy's employment with the Company, including but not limited to the compensation she received from the Company and the termination of her employment.

WHEREAS, the Parties have executed a written Settlement Agreement and Release of Claims, pursuant to which each party shall bear its own respective costs and attorneys' fees.

## Case 3:08-cv-05377-JL Document 68 Filed 03/24/11 Page 3 of 3

Case3:08-cv-05377-JL Document67 Filed03/23/11 Page3 of 3

1	For the reasons set forth above and pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule		
2	41(a)(1)(A)(ii), the Parties hereby jointly Stipulate to the dismissal with prejudice of this entire		
3	action and request that the Court terminate all proceedings in this action.		
4			
5			
6	Dated: March 22, 2011 R	IGHETTI GLUGOSKI, P.C.	
7			
8	B		
9		Attorneys for Plaintiff Stephanie Priddy	
10	1	IORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	
11	Dated: March 22, 2011	IORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLF	
12	В	y Eric Meckley /S/	
13	D.	Eric Meckley Attorneys for Defendant	
14		LANE BRYANT, INC.	
15			
16			
17		SO ORDERED	
18		7	
19		AMES LARSON	
20		IAGISTRATE JUDGE	
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26 27			
28			
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO		STIPULATION DISMISSING ACTION	